

REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 4, 2007, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,955,425 to Childs et al. (the “Childs reference”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,631,558 to Hara. Also, claims 2-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Childs in view of Hara as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 2001-1328279 to Tsukada (the “Tsukada reference”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,164,766 to Erickson (the “Erickson reference”).

In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended the three independent claims 1, 19 and 20 to clarify the fundamental differences between the claimed invention and the above cited combinations relying on the newly cited Hara reference. The claims as amended clarify a fundamental structural difference between the claimed invention and the cited prior arts. The resulting functional difference resulting from the structural difference is also explained below. The support for this amendment is found in Paragraphs 9, 29, and Figures 3A-8B, and throughout the specifications.

The Hara reference discloses plates 30a-1, 30a-2, 30a-3 and 30b-1, 30b-2, 30b-3 as partitions. *See* Figure 3 of the Hara reference. However, the plates are fixed to the ink chamber at the bottom portion of the chamber and the plates do not extend entire length of the inner surfaces. For example in Figure 2 of the Hara references, there are two areas, one between the inner side surface of ceiling wall 20 and plate 30a-1, and another between the inner surface of the guiding plate 192 and plate 30a-1. *See* Figure 2 of the Hara reference. On the other hand, the ink chamber of the claimed invention is separated by the partition wall 102 and the ink must flow over the partition wall 102 through the communication channel 103 for the ink to travel between the separated chambers. *See* Paragraph 102 of the specification. However, in the Hara

references, the plates do not extend to the top of the chamber but also do not extend to the inner side surface of the chamber, allowing the ink to be partitioned but not separated.

Further, Hara reference discloses the opening 21 for supplying outside air. This opening prevents the build up of negative pressure within the ink chamber. *See* column 2, lines 42-47 of Hara. On the other hand, as explained above, the partition wall of the claimed invention is fixed at the bottom of the chamber and also at the side surface of the inner surface of the chamber. The structure of the partition wall in the claimed invention generates negative pressure within the chamber as ink is ejected from the inkjet head. *See* paragraph 86 of the specification.


Applicant respectfully points out one of the three basic criteria to establish a prima facie case of obviousness is that the prior art should teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Claim 1 is rejected as obvious over Hara in view of Childs and claims 2-20 are rejected as obvious over Hara in view of Tsukada and Erickson. In view that Hara does not fix the deficiencies of the other arts, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of the claims, to allow the claims, and to pass this application to early issue.

A request for three months extension of time, a request for continued examination of the application and corresponding fees are enclosed. Applicant does not believe that any other fees are due. However, if any additional fees are due, please charge such sums to our Deposit Account 50-1145.

Applicant also respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney before issuing another action. Applicant would like an interview scheduled in order to clarify the differences in the configurations of the claimed invention and the references cited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gerald Levy", written in a cursive style.

Gerald Levy
Registration No. 24,419

Lindsay S. Adams
Registration No. 36,425

Attorneys for Applicants

Day Pitney LLP
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036-7311
212-297-5800